REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated April 15, 2008, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on July 15, 2008. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-12 and 14-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-12 and 14-20 remain pending following entry of this response.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9-12 and 15-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Joshi* (hereinafter "Joshi") U.S. Patent No. 6,839,894. Respectfully, Applicants traverse this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

In this case *Joshi* does not disclose "each and every element as set forth in the claim." For example, J*oshi* does not disclose the method recited by claim 1 for "debugging executable code configured to access associated data in a data repository" that includes the following steps:

> determining whether the monitored executable code has accessed the associated data in the data repository;
> if so, determining whether to display the associated data on the basis of whether the associated data is restricted data; wherein determining whether to display the associated data comprises referencing predefined access restriction rules defining at least one rule preventing at least a portion of the associated data from being displayed to unauthorized users; and

> upon determining not to display the associated data on the basis of the referenced predefined access restriction rules, outputting masking characters on an output screen indicative of the associated data without revealing a value of the associated data, whereby selected data from the data repository is concealed from a user debugging the executable code.

Independent claims 9 and 16 recite similar limitations. *Joshi*, the reference currently being cited by the Examiner, is directed to a method for debugging a software program using "dynamic debug patches and copy on write views." As disclosed in *Joshi*, multiple persons may:

> concurrently test software patches on a software program or debug a problem of the software program. Each person preferably has their own private view, which consists of (1) copied portions of the software program that reflect modifications made by that person, and (2) the portions of the preserved software program that the person has not modified. Providing a private view to each person allows each person to test and debug privately, independently, and concurrently with others.

Joshi, 3:53-62. That is, multiple users may each debug a software program, such as a database. The "copy on write" operation allows each user to access, modify, and view data from the database independently from other users. That is, the "copy on write" operation allows multiple users to debug a database concurrently, without disrupting one another when write operations are performed. On this point, *Joshi* provides as follows:

> For example, execution of the secondary results in a read operation that accesses data 104. The execution of the second software program may also call for a write operation to be performed on some data within the preserved portion 102. The data within the reserved portion that is targeted by the write operation is referred to herein as targeted data 106a. In response to an attempt to perform a write operation on data within the targeted data 106a, a copy is made of the targeted data 106a. The actual modification that would have been made to the targeted data 106a is instead made to the copy, creating a modified copy 106b. In one embodiment, the modified copy 106b is a copy-on-write page of memory.

Joshi, 5:53-65. As disclosed, each concurrent user is provided with unrestricted access to data in the database – each user may execute "a read operation that accesses data 104." Further, each user may independently modify, and view, any changes made to data in the database. Thus, *Joshi* clearly discloses that each user may access and view data from the underlying database.

Nevertheless, the Examiner suggests that *Joshi* discloses a method that includes a step of "upon determining not to display the associated data on the basis of the referenced predefined access restriction rules, outputting masking characters on an output screen indicative of the associated data without revealing a value of the associated data, whereby selected data from the data repository is concealed from a user debugging the executable code," as recited by claim 1. Claims 9 and 16 recite a similar limitation. Specifically, the Examiner suggests:

> [*Joshi* discloses] upon determining not to display the associated data on the basis of the referenced predefined access restriction rules, (Col. 8:1-20, "... Debug and testing operations cannot write to read-only data ...") outputting masking characters on an output screen indicative of the associated data without revealing a value of the associated data, (Col. 8:1-20," ... the debug and testing system preferably produces a logical error message....") whereby selected data from the data repository is concealed from a user debugging the executable code. (Col. 8:1-20, "... the debug and testing system preferably produces a logical error message ...").

Office Action, p.3. The passage being cited by the Examiner provides as follows:

> Such a mounting step facilitates reads from outside data, such as persistent database tables. Debug and testing operations cannot write to the read-only data, and therefore will not make changes to the original persistent structures. Further, when any operation attempts to write to the read-only data, the debug and testing system preferably produces a logical error message, which the debug and testing system makes known to the user.
>
> After copying outside data into the database in a read-only mode, outside data may be treated as part of the preserved portion 102. That is, a user is allowed to perform operations that modify the data, but those operations cause the creation of separate modified copies, and leave the original data intact. Thus, an embodiment of the present invention is applicable to debugging a database and testing of potential solutions to problems in the database where execution of secondary software programs call for accessing data that is outside the current database instance.

Joshi, 7:67 – 8:1-20. Clearly, this passage describes that certain database tables may be marked as "read-only data." And further, that when a user attempts to perform a write operation to "read only data," the system "produces a logical error message." Applicants submit that an error message presented when a user attempts to write to read-only data is plainly distinct from the claimed operation of determining "not to

display data, and instead of displaying "the associated data" by "outputting masking characters on an output screen indicative of the associated data without revealing a value of the associated data," as recited by claim 1. Plainly, the debugging system disclosed in *Joshi* contemplates that users may access and view data without restriction. In fact, *Joshi* discloses that multiple users may do so concurrently. While *Joshi* discloses that users may be prevented from writing to read-only data, nothing in *Joshi* suggests that users debugging a database cannot, in fact, read the read-only data.

For all the foregoing reasons, the claims are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 8, 14 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Joshi* in view of *Kolawa* (U.S. Patent No. 6,085,029).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 8, 14, and 20 depend from independent claims 1, 9, and 16, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants submit that these claims are allowable without the need for further comment.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)